



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE FIRST REPUBLIC IN AMERICA. By Alexander Brown, D. C. L.
Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, Publishers, 1898.

The wonderful development of the English settlements in North America, and the height of power to which the United States and Canada have attained in less than four centuries since the feeble planting at Jamestown first established the English on this continent, have made everything relating to this colony of intense interest to English speaking people; or rather, it should be said, to people of every nation. The pilgrims who settled New England have had many historians, and we have been made familiar with every incident of interest in their planting, and in their previous history. Virginia too has had, from time to time, writers who have labored to preserve her early history but none have so completely exhausted the subject as Dr. Alexander Brown in his "Genesis of the United States," published in 1890, and Mr. Philip A. Bruce in his "Economic History of Virginia," published in 1896.

These writers have drawn from original sources, many of which were hidden from previous historians, and their labors have thrown a flood of light on the early history of Virginia. In the Genesis, the indefatigable labors of Dr. Brown resulted in a chronological arrangement of all the documents which he found bearing on the Virginia colony from 1605 to the year 1616. The author gives the newly discovered or most important documents in full, and makes reference to the others by title simply. In his "History of the First Republic in America," he tells us he used the papers arranged in the Genesis, and others subsequently obtained, and thus he has made his volume include the years 1605 to 1627. Not the least instructive part of his work is that which shows the interest taken by Spain in the colony, and the unsuccessful efforts of the Spanish ministers in London to induce their government to destroy it. Catholic Spain, as is well known, claimed the Virginia territory as her own, and well she might have resisted the settlement on it of Englishmen, carrying English protestant principles, civil and religious. The success of the Virginia colony has given the *coup de grâce* to Spanish occupancy of this continent.

Dr. Brown has written his book in the form of a diary. This is very convenient for the reader, and the author found it very convenient also for indulgence in monologue, in which he freely expresses his opinion of actors and actions, and indulges in many guesses where his evidence is at fault, using the personal pronoun for the first person with painful frequency.

Although Dr. Brown more than once states that it is the duty of an historian to weigh carefully the testimony on both sides, when the facts are disputed, he nevertheless has written a book altogether on *ex parte* evidence, as regards the conduct of affairs in England and Virginia, in matters which were the subjects of dispute. He is the open advocate of the Virginia Company of London under their charters of 1609 and 1612, which he extols, and he denounces the charter of 1606, under which the colony was founded. He very kindly puts his readers on their guard on his title page, where he states that his book is "An account of the origin of this nation, written from the records then (1624) concealed by the council, rather than from the histories then licensed by the crown." The author is, however, forced to use many publications of the company made before 1624, and to confess that some of them were so colored as to be unreliable. These publications are in the line of the policy of the company declared in their first instructions to the colonists, that "they suffer no man to return but by passport from the president and counsel, nor to write any letter of any thing that may discourage others." The history of the colony in Dr. Brown's volume falls into two parts, the first embracing the three years under the charter of 1606, and the second, the fifteen years under the charters of 1609 and 1612. The first he styles the Royal Charter, the second and third the Popular Charters. All three were of course granted by King James, and were thus Royal Charters; but the first put the government of the Virginia Company of London under the control of the king and his Privy Council, while in the others, that company was chartered as a corporation, and allowed to manage its affairs independent of royal control, except when they were of importance to the State. As to the council in Virginia, however, it was controlled by the council of the company in London under all three charters, and much more completely under the last two than under the first; for by that the council in Virginia elected its own president, who was the governor, while he was appointed by the council in London under the other two. Under the first the councilmen in Virginia were appointed by the London Company, under the others they were appointed by the governor; under all three the laws governing the colony were formulated by the council in London entirely until 1619, when the Virginians were allowed an assembly; and afterwards the acts of that body had to be approved by the London Company.

The instructions given by the council in London to Lord Delaware, the first governor they appointed under the second charter, are found in Dr. Brown's "Genesis," and they show him to be vested with "absolute power." Well might Rolfe write in 1616, "The beginning of this plantation was governed by a president and council aristocratically, * * * afterwards a more absolute government was granted monarchically, wherein it still continueth." Dr. Brown, in his attack upon the government under the first charter, quotes the first of these words of

Rolfe, but does not give the last clause, as it conflicts with his theory of the freedom of the second charter; and this is a specimen of Dr. Brown's fairness in this volume. He has used quotation marks for much of his text, but has refrained from informing his readers what authority he is quoting, except in rare instances. He need not, therefore, be surprised to find his readers, after several experiences like the above, becoming somewhat incredulous as to the correctness of his citations.

It is plain that the colony in Virginia, having its chief officers appointed and its laws given by the company in London, was in no sense a republic, which is defined to be "a State in which the supreme authority is exercised by representatives chosen by the people." But Dr. Brown, with strange fatuity, has conceived otherwise, and has named his work "The First Republic in America." Nor is his mistake in the name merely. He has constructed his work on it, and has held up as patriots those who advocated the charters of 1609 and 1612, claiming them to have been republican, and denounced those who approved of the first charter and desired the king to resume the control of the colony, as its enemies. This is the more remarkable when we find that the laws imposed upon the colony under the later charters were tyrannical in the extreme, and were executed with great severity by Gates, Dale and Argall, governors appointed by the London Company. It is true that the granting to the colony the right to an assembly in 1618 was a great advance towards the fulfilment of the guaranty to them of the rights of Englishmen in the several charters. But that right, without doubt, would have been allowed them under the first charter as well, so soon as they had settlements enough to enable them to constitute a respectable representative body. The grant must have been made with the approval of the king, for he did not interfere with it nor withdraw it after he resumed control of the colony. It was made during the administration of Sir Thomas Smith, whose administration commenced with the settlement, and who afterwards urged the king to resume control. Captain Smith, in his history, represents the colony as having been successfully planted during the existence of the first charter, and afterwards as having been badly managed. These statements Dr. Brown labors to prove are false. He displays an intense hatred to Smith, whose character as a man and a writer he endeavors to destroy. Of the twenty-two pages of his preface, some eighteen are devoted to a bitter attack on him, and he never mentions him in the text except to contradict him, to insinuate something discreditable concerning him, or to sneer at him. So prejudiced is he towards Smith that he classes the contemporaneous writers who have taken a different view of him, as advocates of the king's control and enemies of the colony. He thus regards Purchas and the author of the Oxford tract of 1612, and the authors they cite, as falsifiers of history and hostile to the "First Republic in America."

The following will illustrate the author's treatment of Smith: In his

history of the colony Smith states, on the authority of John Rolfe, who was in the colony at that time, that "about the last of August (1619) came in a Dutch man of warre that sold us twenty negars." This statement is important, as it marks the introduction of slavery into Virginia, then the only English colony. Seemingly because Smith makes this statement, Dr. Brown labors to disprove it, and to show that it was the Treasurer, an English ship, that brought in the negroes. This vessel came in with the Dutch vessel, called "the man of war of Flushing." It was said that the Earl of Warrick was interested in its ventures, and that she carried negroes from the West Indies to Bermuda. Dr. Brown thereupon concludes that she brought the twenty negroes to Virginia, and that Rolfe and Smith made a false statement in order to shield the Earl.

At pp. 146-7 Dr. Brown without the slightest ground, insinuates that Captain Smith in 1611, furnished Velasco, the Spanish Minister, with charts of Virginia, and the Atlantic coast between 34° and 52° north latitude, and attempts to produce the impression that Smith did not draw the map of Virginia which he sent to England as his work.

Dr. Brown often alludes to Captain Smith in the most contemptuous manner as "The Historian." He also condemns him for his vanity. Has a fellow feeling ceased to make one kind?

The germ of free institutions in America is to be found in that section of the charter 1606 guaranteeing to the colonists the rights of Englishmen, as fully as if they resided in England. One of these, and the most valued of them, was the right to be represented in the body which enacted laws for them. It was the development of this right in America that resulted in our political freedom. The germ thus embedded in the first charter was nurtured, according to the views of the men in England who controlled the London Company. They did not plant that germ, they only nurtured it. While the colony was small in numbers, no representative body was allowed them under either of the first three charters. When they had eleven settlements, they were considered numerous enough to have a House of Burgesses, and this was granted them by men, some of whom had governed the colony under the first charter. An examination of the charters shows, that the London Company had power to grant this assembly under the first, as well as under the second and third charters, the only difference being the control of the king under the first. But we have seen that having granted this with the germ of freedom in it, he never interfered with its development into an assembly.

Dr. Brown conceives that Captain John Smith conveyed false ideas of the first seventeen years of our colonial history, and that the issues he raises with him "involve the true basis of our foundation." He accordingly, in his preface, describes these issues thus:

(1) "The historic issue is between John Smith, the author, in England,

and the managers of the movement, on whom the enterprise was dependent in England and in Virginia."

(2) "The personal issue is between John Smith, the actor in Virginia, and the other counsellors during his time here, and the committees of the company in England for the rewarding of men on their merits, whose business it was to decide such matters at that time."

These correspond with the periods into which we have seen that the volume naturally falls under the author's treatment, and in discussing them we will be able to review these periods. Our discussion will necessarily be brief, in order to be limited to the space allowed for this review. To notice all of Dr. Brown's errors would require a volume.

Taking up the second head, as first an order of time, we find that Dr. Brown relies on the testimony of Percy, West, Martin, Archer and Ratcliffe, as showing that so far from Smith's services in Virginia being valuable, "he did more harm than good as an actor in Virginia." He does not, and cannot, point to such a statement made by any of these men, and he only guesses at this opinion, deeming them enemies of Smith.

Let us examine the characters and services of these men in connection with their attitude towards Smith.

George Percy was the son of the Earl of Northumberland, and was a brave but weak man. This was shown by his failure as president after Smith left, when in a few weeks the colony was reduced from a thriving state to one of abject wretchedness. So reduced in fact that Gates on his arrival took the remnant aboard and started for England. This can be excused on the ground of sickness, but when he was left as president at a later period the affairs of the colony showed his inefficiency.

The only writings of Percy that we have any knowledge of are the extracts from his narrative given by Purchas in his *Pilgrimes* and by Rev. E. D. Neil in the preface to his *Virginia Vetusta*. In the extracts given by Purchas there is no attack upon Smith. The extract given by Neil is a mutilated paper on affairs in Virginia from 1609 to 1612, prepared for his brother, the then Earl, and makes no reference to Smith. Neil, however, gives the letter Percy wrote his brother when sending him his MSS., and in it is the following excuse for writing: "In regard that many untreuthes concerninge theis proceedinges have been formerly published, wherein the author hathe nott spared to appropriate many deserts to himselfe which he never performed, and stuffed his relacyons with so many falsities and malycious detractions, nott only of this parts and tyme, which I have selected to treat of, but of former occurrentes also."

No date is given to the MSS. or to this letter, and the only thing we have by which to fix its date is a reference to Sir Samuel Argall, who was knighted in 1622. Smith's *History of Virginia* appeared in 1624, and his account of the colony from 1609 to 1612, which included Percy's administrations, is taken from the Oxford Tract of 1612, the writings of

William Block, a colonist, Declaration by the Council 1610, Lord Delaware's report of the condition of the colony, and Ralph Hamor's account of the colony from 1611 to 1614, published in 1615. We are told in the Oxford Tract that there existed many writings concerning the colony between 1609 and 1612. Now an examination of Smith's account during this period shows that it is taken entirely from his authorities, and while he describes the decadence of the colony after he left in 1609, he lays no blame on Percy, who is described as sick up to the time that Gates superseded him. Indeed, Smith in his writings is friendly to Percy. Again, an examination of Hamor's book will show that he notes, and severely condemns, the mismanagement of this and previous periods, and as Percy complains of a former work, it is much more probable that he refers to Hamor, who published in 1615, only three year's after Percy's return to England, than to Smith, who published in 1624, a year before Percy left England for the low countries.

Dr. Brown, at page 94, puts into the mouth of Percy a statement of misconduct of Smith in winning to him the men that came with the ship of Gates', but he does not inform us where to find it, and it is not to be found in the only two writings of Percy noted by Dr. Brown in his "Genesis," nor in any other writings known to us. We are constrained, therefore, to require the production of his authority, or to reject the genuineness of his quotation.

Francis West, we are told, had a quarrel with Smith about the location of the settlement at the falls of James river. West wanted it on the river bank. Smith very properly thought this would be unhealthy, and wished it on the highland. The character of West, however, appears most unfavorably in the fact, noted by Dr. Brown, that in January, 1610, when the colony was suffering for food, he was sent in a ship to trade with the Indians for corn, which he did successfully, but instead of bringing it to the suffering colonists, he deserted them, and sailed with his provisions to England. But, further, Dr. Brown does not favor us with any writings of West in reference to Smith, or which he can guess applied to him.

The character of Captain John Martin is thus forcibly given by the council and company for Virginia in 1622 (*Neil's Virginia Company of London*, p. 312, &c.): "It is strange unto them that Captain Martin, who is said to have ruined as well his own estate (if ever he had any) as also the estate of others who put him in trust (as namely Captain Bargrave), and who hath made his own territory there a receptacle of vagabonds and bankrupts and other disorderly persons, (whereof there hath bin made publique complaint), and who is famous for nothing but all kinde of base condicions, so published in print by the relations of the proceedings of the colony about 10 years since, and who for the said condicions was displaced by Lord Delaware from beinge of the council as a moste unworthie person, and who hath presumed of his owne authority, (no

way derived from his Majestie), to give unjust sentence of death upon divers of his Majestie's subjects, and seen the same put in cruell execution, should dare offer himself to his sacred Majestie as a agent, either for matters of good husbandrie or good order."

In the same author's *Virginia Carolorum*, page 26, we find that "on 15th Janr., 1625, Governor Wyatt and council notified the Privy Council in England that they had been forced to suspend Captain John Martin from their body." These accounts shown by the company's records are not given to but concealed from, his readers by Dr. Brown, with whom Captain John Martin is a favorite. Dr. Brown gives us no writings of Martin in reference to Smith.

Gabriel Archer came to Virginia in 1607. Wingfield, who was no friend of Smith's, described him as "troubled with an ambitious spirit" and "alwayes hatching of some mutiny; in my tyme he might have appeared an author of 3 severall mutynies." Wingfield tells of Archer being sworn by Ratcliffe as a member of the council during Smith's captivity among the Indians, "contrary to the king's instructions," and of Archer's attempt to have Smith hung on his return, holding him criminally responsible for his two men killed by the Indians during his absence from his boat. Wingfield also states that after Captain Newport's arrival in January, 1608, on an investigation of affairs, Archer was removed from the council, and describes him thus: "Whose insolency did looke upon that little himself with great sighted spectacles, derogating from others' merites by spueing out his venomous libells and infamous chronicles upon them, as doth appeare in his owne hand wrighting; for which, and other worse trickes he had not escaped the halter, but that Capt. Newport interposed his advice to the contrarye." Dr. Brown cited Wingfield time and again, but he does not give his estimate of Archer, who is another of Dr. Brown's favorites. The only writing of Archer that refers to Smith's administration in Virginia is a letter of 31st August, 1609, written on the arrival of four of the fleet of Sir Thomas Gates, and before the vessel carrying Sir Thomas with the new charter and his commission as Governor came in. In this letter Archer says: "Now did we all lament the absence of our Governor, for contentions began to grow, and factions and partakings, &c. Insomuch as the president (Capt. Smith), to strengthen his authority, accorded with the mariners, and gave not any due respect to many worthy gentlemen that came in our ships; whereupon they generally (having my consent) chose Master West, my Lord de La Warre's brother, to be their Governour, or president *de bene esse*, in the absence of Sir Thomas Gates, or if he miscarried by sea, then to continue till we heard news from our counsell in England. This choice of him they made not to disturbe the old president during his time, but as his authority expired, then to take upon him the sole government, with such assistants of the Captains as discreetest persons as the colonie afforded."

This letter refers to the fact that these first ships brought news of a new charter and Governor, which, however, were to have no authority until they were landed at Jamestown, and that Smith refused to surrender his authority as president until such landing, though it was demanded by Archer and others; and the mariners sustained him in this position, which was evidently correct. It will be noted that Archer does not mention Smith's services, but only his position as to the presidency before the arrival of Gates with the new charter.

Captain John Ratcliff's true name was Sicklemore, and we have no explanation why he went under an alias. He was selected president after Wingfield was deposed, and we are told by Wingfield that in the absence of Smith, and without the consent of Martin, the other councilman surviving, he swore Archer in as a member of the council, contrary to his oath, and the instructions of the king. He probably joined in the condemnation of Smith on his return from captivity, for Wingfield tells us that Smith was about to be hung by order of the council, which then consisted of Ratcliffe, Martin and Archer beside Smith, when the timely arrival of Newport saved him. Ratcliffe's presidency was a failure, and he showed his weakness by allowing himself to be outwitted by Powhatan, who murdered him and fourteen of his men in December, 1609. In speaking of a trip afterwards up York river, Ralph Hamor describes the Indians they met as, "bragging, as well they might, that wee had ever had the worst of them on that river, instancing by Captain Ratcliffe (not worthy remembering, but to his dishonor) who with most of his company they betrayed and murdered." It appears by this that Hamor had a poor opinion of Ratcliffe as a man. Smith had been more than a match for the wiley chief, but the Indian had overmatched Ratcliffe.

The only writing of Ratcliffe relating to Smith, of which we have any knowledge, is a letter from Jamestown, 4th October, 1609, he having returned in Gates' fleet with Archer. In this he states: "We heard that all the counsell were dead but Captain Smith the President, who reigned sole governor, without assisstantes, and would at first admitt of no counsell but himself. This man is sent home to answer some misdemeanors, whereof I perswade me he can scarcely clear himself from great imputation of blame." These charges are not specified by Ratcliffe, but they are given in the Oxford tract, and are of the most trifling kind. Principal among them is his refusal to yield his authority before the arrival of the new charter. We never hear of these charges in England, and must conclude they were dismissed as idle by the council in London. Yet Dr. Brown brings up this statement of Ratcliffe time and again against Smith. It is apparent however that Ratcliffe does not pretend to relate Smith's services in the colony.

Leaving out Percy, who has not as yet taken his place in the line, these inimical witnesses summoned by Dr. Brown in his prosecution of Smith, present a beggarly array. And the prosecution is made ridiculously ab-

surd when we find, that every one of them when called to testify as to Smith's services to the colony, stands mute. It has remained for Dr. Brown to put into their mouths what he would like for them to say.

In striking contrast with this lack of evidence on behalf of Dr. Brown's prosecution, is the abundance of evidence of Captain Smith's invaluable services in Virginia. They are very fully set forth in the historical part of the Oxford tract of 1612; not a production of Captain Smith, as Dr. Brown would persuade his readers, but written by Richard Potts, a colonist, and a compilation from "the writings of Thomas Studley, the first provant maister, Anas Todkill, Walter Russell, Doctor of Phisicke, Nathaniel Powel, William Phettyplace, Richard Wyffin, Thomas Abbay, Thomas Hope, Richard Potts, and the labors of divers other diligent observers, that were residents in Virginia, and perused and confirmed by diverse now resident in England that were actors in the business." Thomas Abbay, another colonist, certifies to its correctness, and we have evidence that none of Smith's writings were used in the compilation, as the letter which accompanied it, when sent to Smith, states that it was compiled from the discourses and relations "of such which have walked and observed the land of Virginia with you." Purchas used the same authorities, and others of the same time, knew Smith personally, and was a member of the London Company. He was a man of high character and great learning, and his account of Virginia affairs in his "Pilgrimes" makes Smith the master spirit during his stay in the colony, and its real founder. Thus we have the testimony of Purchas to the faithfulness of the compilation, and the truthfulness of the authorities of the Oxford tract. Smith embodied this tract in his history of Virginia, and that history was endorsed as true by Michael and William Phettyplace and Richard Wiffin, who came to Virginia with the first supply, and by John Codrington and Raleigh Crashaw who came with the second supply. Thus we have the united testimony of fourteen colonists who were in Virginia with Smith, of his services to the colony, and they were evidently men of cultivation and character, as is shown by their writings being thus treated as authority. It will be remembered also, that the Oxford tract was licensed by the crown before the king had any disposition to resume control of the colony. Indeed he had just enlarged the charter of the London Company. We may sum up the account of Captain Smith's services in Virginia, given in the Oxford tract, as follows:

He explored the country, and informed himself as to the characteristics of the natives. He wrote a description of the country and the natives, and accompanied it with a map, which are marvels of accuracy, considering the circumstances under which they were made. He saved the colony from starvation by procuring food from the Indians, sometimes by trade and at others by force, when they were refused to trade. He prevented the abandonment of the colony three times, when it was planned by those who are accounted his enemies. He made settlements

at the Falls and at Nansamund, more healthful for situation than Jamestown. He brought the Indians into subjection, so that they not only ceased to annoy the colony, but took care of some of the men during a scarcity of food in 1609. He forced the men to clear the forest and plant corn and vegetables, so as to make the colony self-sustaining, and at the end of his term as president, he left it amply provided with provisions, animals and agricultural implements. He thus demonstrated the practicability of making permanent the colony. That he was the main stay of the colony while he was with it is shown in the Oxford Tract by the fact therein stated, that immediately after his departure everything began to go to ruin, and when Gates arrived in May, 1610, he found the colony in such a hopeless condition that he took the miserable remnant aboard and started to sail for England; and had he not met Lord Delaware in the river with fresh supplies of men and provisions, the colony would have been abandoned. The honor of these great services awarded Captain Smith by so many of those who served with him in Virginia, and never denied him by a reputable historian until the rise of Dr. Alexander Brown, is now, forsooth, to be blighted by the breath of a Virginian, who aspires to be "the historian" of the colony while under the company.

As to the issue between Captain Smith and the committee of the London Council for rewarding men on their merits, Dr. Brown brings us no evidence, and we have very good evidence that Smith's claim was allowed, as he is reported by Neil to have said at a meeting of the London Company on 4th February, 1623, "that havinge spent upon Virginia a verie great matter, he did by god's blessinge hope to receave this yeare a good quantity of tobacco, which he woulde not willingly come under the hands of them that woulde performe the buisness for love, and not upon good and competent salary." As he had no farm in Virginia, he must have expected to receive some of the company's tobacco, and he could have had no such expectation except on a favorable report from the committee.

In reading Dr. Brown's statement in his preface of the historic issue between John Smith, the author, and the managers of the colony in England and Virginia, one finds it hard to pick out of the seventeen pages of abuse of Smith, what the author really considers in issue. Let us content ourselves with the following statement on page vii :

"In brief, the real cause of the defeilements was not in the managing of the business as stated by Smith, and the colony was not brought to a good state of forwardness under the king's form of government by Smith." The term of Captain Smith's presidency ended 20th September, 1609, according to Dr. Brown, and he adds (p. 98), "we have not the exact figures, but from contemporary evidences it may be set down as certain that the end of September, 1609, saw less than three hundred English living in Virginia, and that they were in a most deplorable con-

dition; but in after years several writers for sundry reasons, which will be explained hereafter, deemed it advisable in the interest of the ideas of the king, or for personal or other motives, to assert that the colony had been brought to a good state of forwardness." Set over against this the following statement in the Oxford Tract of 1612, written and printed ten years at least before the king is said to have desired to resume control of the colony, and published by Rev. Wm. Symonds, a warm friend of the Company. Speaking of Smith's departure, 4th October, 1609, this tract says: "Leaving us thus with 3 ships, 7 boats, commodities ready to trade, the harvest newly gathered, 10 weeks provisions in the store, 490 and odde persons, 24 pieces of ordinances, 300 muskets, snaphanches and firelocks, shot, powder and match sufficient, curats, pikes, swords, and moryons more than men, the salvages their language and habitation well knowne to 100 well trained soldiers, nets for fishing, tools of all sortes to worke, apparell to supply our wants, 6 mares and a horse, 5 or 600 sheep, what was brought or bread there remained." Now as the four ships of Gates' fleet came into the river on 11th August, and had added what they brought to what they found, and thus made the list of articles given above, it is evident that Dr. Brown has mistated the condition of the colony at the end of September.

As to the health of the colony, we have the statement of Gabriel Archer in the letter heretofore mentioned, dated 31st August, 1609, in which he says: "The people of our colonie were found all in health (for the most part), howbeit when Capt. Argall came in (a month before), they were in much distresse, for many were dispersed in the savage towns, living upon their almes for an ounce of copper a day, and fourscore lived twenty miles from the Fort, and fed upon nothing but oysters eight weeks space, having no other allowance at all, neither were the people of the country able to releive them if they would." It will be noted that he does not report scarcity after Argall's arrival.

This billeting among the Indians, and living on oysters, were made necessary by the fact that the rats from the ships had destroyed much of the provisions of the colony stored in their magazine, and the corn crop was not far enough advanced to use as food. But when Smith left in October, besides the provisions obtained from Argall, the crop was getting ripe enough for use. And Archer, so far from disproving the statement in the Oxford Tract, disproves the statement of Dr. Brown as to the condition of the colony. The colony rapidly deteriorated after Smith left, and when Captain West ran away in the Swallow to England in December or January following, its condition was greatly for the worse. The first difficulties with the Indians after the arrival of Archer were at the Falls, and are directly attributable to the conduct of West and Archer in command at those posts and their men.

Let us look at the management of the business, and in estimating this a comparison of the means used, with the result, will be valuable, if not

conclusive. During Smith's stay in the colony, nearly three years, the London Company sent 295 men, not counting the men in the fleet of Gates. When Smith left, 4th October, 1609, there were of these very certainly 200 living, though Dr. Brown supposes about eighty. Between the date of their first charter and 1624, when their last charter was annulled, they expended, according to Smith, £200,000, and sent from 8,000 to 10,000 men. Dr. Brown does not seem to contest these figures (page 615), and admits that less than 1,100 men were living in 1624 (page 612). It will be seen that with all the inexperience of the first three years, and the terrible mortality of the first summer, Smith saved a much larger proportion of men than the company during its entire existence. This lavish expenditure of money and men can only be accounted for by mismanagement. Dr. Brown insists that much of the loss of life was due to the bad climate. The climate of their settlements had been tested by 1609, and we are not told of any sickly places except Jamestown, which had a marsh on one side. It was mismanagement to have continued this as the principal settlement, with this knowledge. But we have other and abundant evidence that the climate was good, except at Jamestown. In the answer of a number of old settlers and mariners to the pamphlet of Captain Nathaniel Butler, styled "The unmasked face of our colony in Virginia, as it was in the winter of the year 1622," we find the statements (*Neil's Virginia Company*, pages 295-6) that all their settlements on James River were "verie healthful and high, except James city, which is yett as high as Debtforde or Radcliffe." Keccautan, they tell us, was healthy for "well governed men." Dr. Brown tells us, and we know it from other sources, that the council in London and the colony in Virginia blamed each other for the misfortunes of the colony. One would think from this that both were more or less to blame, but Dr. Brown insists that no one was to blame. Yet the fact is admitted by him that diseased men were shipped, and "Pest ships" were used in transmitting settlers by the London Council, and not enough provisions sent to feed the new settlers until they could make crops. And as to the colonists, it is apparent that it must have been laziness and want of good management, as charged, that prevented them from making their own food on the rich James River bottoms.

The severest arraignment of the managers of the London Company, much more severe than anything from Captain Smith's pen, is found in the answer of the General Assembly in Virginia to a publication by Alderman Johnson and others defending the administration of Sir Thomas Smith (1607 to 1619). It is at page 407 of Neil's history of the London Company. Among other things it states: "In these 12 years of Sir Thomas Smith his government, we averr, that the colony for the most part remayned in greate want and misery under the most severe and cruell laws, sent over in printe and contrary to the expresse letter of the king in his most gracious charter, and mercylessly executed oftentimes

without tryall or judgement." This occurred under Dr. Brown's *Magna Carta* of 1609. This paper then goes on to give details of the famines the colonists passed through. It represents, "the people never goinge to worke but out of the bitterness of theire spirits, threatening execrable curses uppon Sir Thomas Smith." It adds "And rather to be reduced to live under the like government, we desire his Majesty that commissioners may be sent over, with authority to hange us."

As to the management after Sir Thomas Smith's administration, we have an account in the petition of Alderman Johnson and others in April, 1623, praying the king to appoint a commission to enquire into the conduct of the business. This is given in Neil's history of the London Company, page 387. After making due allowance for the party spirit then existing in the company, we can safely conclude that there is enough of truth in these papers to warrant the charge of mismanagement. Indeed the very fact that the colonists had been so careless as to allow the savages, whose character for treachery they knew, to plan and accomplish the terrible massacre of 1622, is strong evidence of mismanagement. Mr. Neil, on page 390, quotes a contemporaneous letter of John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, in which it is stated that the Earl of Warwick, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Henry Milday, Alderman Johnson and many more, were in this move to give the king control of the colony again, because of mismanagement.

But Dr. Brown is filled with admiration of the noble motives which actuated the London Company in planting and preserving the Virginia Colony; and he denounces Smith for mistaking those motives and charging selfishness on the managers. Let us see how the company itself stated its motives. We find in the *Genesis*, at pp. 339-40, their statement. It embraces three things: First, to Christianize the Indians, second, "to provide and build up for the public Honor and safety of our Gracious King and his Estates," a colony in America, third, "the appearance and assurance of Private Commodity to the particular undertakers by recovering and possessing to themselves a fruitful land, whence they may furnish and provide this kingdom, with all such necessities and defects under which we labour." These motives soon resolved themselves into the last named, so far as the management was concerned. Doubtless many members of the company were actuated by the first two, which they called "Religious" and "Noble," but the merchants seemed to have controlled the management, and they wished for the returns of commerce. No great effort was ever made to Christianize the Indians, even by Dr. Brown's account, before the massacre. He only names two converts, Pocahontas and Chanco. After that act of treachery, there was no pretence of such an effort. The whole aim was to kill or drive away the Indians. As to the "Noble" motive of founding an English dominion in America, that was hardly consistent with their effort to cut loose from the authority of the king, and their refusal to

allow him to resume control of the colony in 1624, when they were assured of remuneration for their investments. It would have been an anomolous sight indeed, to have had a considerable part of the British Empire governed by a corporation, independent of the king. Dr. Brown himself furnishes abundant evidence of the disposition of the London Company to use the Virginia colony for the purpose of their gain. They sent to Virginia, goods that could not be manufactured there, on which high prices were fixed, and they took in exchange tobacco at a low price, fixed by themselves, thus making a large double profit; and this became very oppressive to the colony, and aided in the division in the company, which caused its downfall. Captain John Smith was not far wrong therefore, when he attacked the mismanagement and selfish motives of the London Council in their conduct of the affairs of the colony.

It is but right to forget, as far as possible, the mistakes made in the early management of the colony. The conduct of the London Company in their persistent determination to make the enterprise a success, and the sacrifices of the company and of the colonists in accomplishing that success, are beyond all praise. The world should ever hold them in grateful remembrance, But Dr. Brown committed a great mistake in his bungling effort to depreciate some of the noblest of these men, and to magnify some of the most unworthy. As a collector of historical matter he proved to be a great success, as a historian he is a lamentable failure.

W. W. HENRY.

SOUTH CAROLINA UNDER THE PROPRIETARY GOVERNMENT, 1670-1719. Edward McCrady. Cloth, crown 8vo., \$3.50 net. Macmillan & Co., New York and London, 1897.

(CONCLUDED.)

An assumption with perhaps still less foundation is that there were no professional lawyers in the Province, and that far into the Royal period judicial offices were held by laymen. This was certainly true in some cases, as in those of Chief Justice Bohun and some of the later Assistant Judges; but it is too improbable to be accepted upon mere negative evidence. There is no proof that, *hibernice dicens*, all the lawyers were laymen, though the paucity of professional men in a sparse population required many to be "all-rounders;" and men like Gibbes, Moore, Toott and Rhett held in turn almost every office in the government. The extremely interesting chapter on Piracy is taken largely, though with due acknowledgment, from Hughson and other investigators; but General McCrady has clearly shown the injustice of the term "Carolina Pirates," and has drawn for us a very just distinction between pirates like Worley, "Blackbeard," and Steele Bonnet, and the men who fled